## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DARREN SHANKS,

Plaintiff,

V.

E. MENDEZ, et al.,

DARREN SHANKS,

Case No.: 1:20-cv-1083 JLT SAB

ORDER ADOPTING IN FULL FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS GRANTING
DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY
JUDGEMENT

(Doc. 56)

Defendants.

Darren Shanks asserts his civil rights were violated and seeks to hold the defendants liable for retaliation in violation of the First Amendment pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Defendants seek summary judgment on the claim. (Doc. 56.)

The assigned magistrate judge found the defendants were entitled to qualified immunity, "because an inmate's right to refuse to provide information relating to a prison investigation was not clearly established in 2018 (and is not today), [and] no reasonable prison official would have been on notice that their conduct violated Plaintiff's constitutional rights." (Doc. 56 at 10.) The magistrate judge observed: "Plaintiff has pointed to no authority establishing that an inmate has a constitutional right to refuse to provide information regarding a prison investigation about a prior incident, nor could the Court find authority consistent with the Supreme Court's present standards concerning what constitutes 'clearly established.'" (*Id.* at 11.) Therefore, the magistrate judge recommended the motion for summary judgment be granted on August 9, 2022. (*Id.*)

## Case 1:20-cv-01083-JLT-SAB Document 57 Filed 09/07/22 Page 2 of 2

1	The Findings and Recommendations granted 21 days for any party to file any objections and		
2	informed the parties that the failure to do so may waive rights on appeal. (Doc. 56 at 11, citing		
3	Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 838- 39 (9th Cir. 2014); Baxter v. Sullivan, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394		
4	(9th Cir. 1991)). No objections were filed and the time to do so has passed.		
5	According to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(C), this Court conducted a <i>de novo</i> review of the case.		
6	Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court concludes the magistrate judge's Findings and		
7	Recommendations are supported by the record and by proper analysis. Thus, the Court <b>ORDERS</b> :		
8	1.	The Findings and Recomme	endations issued on August 9, 2022 (Doc. 56) are
9		<b>ADOPTED</b> in full.	
10	2.	Defendants' motion for sum	imary judgment (Doc. 49) is <b>GRANTED</b> .
11	3.	The Clerk of Court is directed	ed to enter judgment in favor of Defendants and to close
12		this case.	
13			
14	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
15	Dated:	September 7, 2022	Jennya Musson
16			UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			